



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/408,429	09/29/1999	MIKLOS SANDORFI	07072/086001	4042

22494 7590 09/29/2003

DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP
SUITE 101
275 TURNPIKE STREET
CANTON, MA 02021-2310

EXAMINER

TRAN, DENISE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2186

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/408,429

Applicant(s)

SANDORFI, MIKLOS

Examiner

Denise Tran

Art Unit

2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 8-17 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The request filed on 7/31/03 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/408,429 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.
2. The applicant's amendment filed 7/31/03 has been considered. Claims 1-17 and 19 are presented for examination. Claim 18 has been canceled.
3. **Claims 5, 8-17, and 19 are objected** to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
5. Claims 1 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,356,972, (hereinafter Chin 972).

As per claim 1, Chin 972 teaches a processor interface disposed between a main memory and a microprocessor (e.g., figs.1-2, el. 14 disposed between els. Processor 12

Art Unit: 2186

and main memory 18; col. 10, lines 14-15), comprising: a semi conductor integrated circuit having formed therein (e.g., col. 7, lines 56-60): a data rebuffering section (e.g., figs. 2, 4, el. 42 or/and queues 50) adapted to selectively couple data from any one of a plurality of bi-directional data ports (e.g., memory port and PCI port) to a bi directional data port of the microprocessor (e.g., fig. 2, processor port) selectively in accordance with a control signal (e.g. col. 5, lines 8-15; col. 6, lines 10-35; and col. 8, lines 47-55); and a main memory interface (e.g., figs. 2, 4, memory interface 44) adapted for coupling to the main memory (e.g., col. 3, lines 22-25) for the microprocessor, such main memory interface being coupled to the data rebuffering section (e.g., figs. 2, 4, connections from memory interface 44 to el. 42) for providing control signals to the main memory for enabling data transfer between the main memory and the microprocessor through the data rebuffering section (e.g., col. 8, lines 55-65).

As per claim 6, Chin 972 shows wherein the data rebuffering section includes: a selector responsive to the control signal for coupling data between a selected one of the bi-directional data ports and the bi-directional data port of the microprocessor (e.g. col. 5, lines 8-15; col. 6, lines 10-35; and col. 8, lines 47-55).

As per claim 7, Chin 972 shows wherein the data rebuffering section includes: a selector responsive to the control signal for coupling the bi-directional data port of the microprocessor to either: a selected one of the bi-directional data ports; or the main

memory, selectively in accordance with the control signal (e.g. col. 5, lines 8-15; col. 6, lines 10-35; and col. 8, lines 47-55).

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin 972 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Stolt et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,721,860 (hereinafter Stolt).

As per claims 2-3, Chin 972 shows the memory is a selected one of a plurality of memory types and one memory type is SDRAM (e.g., col. 3, lines 1-5) . Chin (972) does not shows each type having a different data transfer protocol and wherein the main memory interface is configured in accordance with the selected one of the plurality of memory types to provide a proper memory protocol to data being transferred between the processor and the memory through the main memory interface. Stolt shows each type having a different data transfer protocol (e.g., abstract) and wherein the main memory interface is configured in accordance with the selected one of the plurality of memory types to provide data being transferred between the processor and

the memory through the main memory interface (e.g., abstract; col. 5, line 22 and et seq.); each memory type having a different data transfer protocol and the main memory interface is configured to provide a proper memory protocol to data being transferred (e.g., abstract and col. 2, line 11 and et seq.; col. 5, line 35 and et seq.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Stolt into the system of Chin (972) because it would provide an independently controlling of a selected memory type.

As per claim 4, Furthermore, Chin 972 and Stolt do not explicitly show the use of RDRAM. "Official Notice, is taken that both the concept and the advantages of providing RDRAM are well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a RDRAM because it would provide a high speed memory accessing.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Denise Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-9823. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Thursday and an alternated Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on (703) 305-3821. The fax phone numbers for

Art Unit: 2186

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for central Official communications and (703) 746-7240 for Non Official communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Dennis

D.T.
September 21, 2003